

Naval War College Review

Volume 73
Number 3 *Summer 2020*

Article 2

2020

From the Editors

Robert Ayer

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review>

Recommended Citation

Ayer, Robert (2020) "From the Editors," *Naval War College Review*. Vol. 73 : No. 3 , Article 2.
Available at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review/vol73/iss3/2>

This From the Editor is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Naval War College Review by an authorized editor of U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. For more information, please contact repository.inquiries@usnwc.edu.

FROM THE EDITORS

Much has been written about the Maritime Strategy developed by the U.S. Navy in the 1980s to counter Soviet ballistic-missile submarine (SSBN) operations in a major war. Less attention has been given to its intelligence backstory. Bradford Dismukes, in “The Return of Great-Power Competition: Cold War Lessons about Strategic Antisubmarine Warfare and Defense of Sea Lines of Communication,” analyzes the failure of the Navy in the 1970s to understand the essentially defensive posture of the Soviet SSBN force in its northern “bastions,” and hence the USN exaggeration of the Soviet naval threat to NATO’s sea lines of communication in the North Atlantic. Dismukes argues that we must be careful not to repeat this error in designing naval forces and strategies to counter the Russian (or Chinese) navy today. Bradford Dismukes is a former U.S. naval intelligence officer and long-standing student of the Soviet navy.

The reemergence of great-power competition is also the premise of James A. Russell’s “Twenty-First Century Innovation Pathways for the U.S. Navy in the Age of Competition.” Beginning with a brief review of the two great historical eras of American naval innovation, with their effective adaptation to the strategic and fiscal realities of the day, he then focuses on the broad failure of the Navy in the 1990s to design and build a fleet adequate to the demands of the twenty-first century. Faulting in particular the innovative yet problem-plagued littoral combat ship, *Zumwalt*-class destroyer, and *Ford*-class aircraft carrier, he argues that the Navy missed an opportunity to anticipate the era of unmanned systems that is now so rapidly upon us. James A. Russell is a professor at the Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey, California.

James Kraska and Yusuke Saito, in “The Law of Military Operations and Self-Defense in the U.S.-Japan Alliance,” provide a valuable analysis of a potential fault line in America’s alliance with Japan that perhaps is not recognized sufficiently. In the United States, of course, the executive branch as personified in the president has considerable leeway to respond to military crises on its own; in Japan, reflecting the constitutional legacy of its defeat in World War II, a variety of contingencies involving the commitment of Japanese military forces require formal approval by the Japanese Diet. It is critical that these differences and their effects be understood fully on both sides and reflected in operational planning. James Kraska is chairman of the Stockton Center for International Law at the Naval

War College; Commander Yusuke Saito is a legal officer in the Japan Maritime Self-Defense Force.

War termination is an underappreciated and understudied aspect of war. One has only to look at the performance of the U.S. government in the aftermath of its recent wars in Afghanistan and Iraq to be convinced of this. The story of the management of the end of World War II in the Pacific is a great object lesson in this regard. In “Conditional Surrender: Conflict Termination in the Pacific, 1945,” Richard J. Shuster and Takuya Shimodaira present an unusual analysis of these events from the perspectives of both the victor and the vanquished. As the title of the piece suggests, the American victory may have been unconditional as far as the Japanese military was concerned, but the translation of military victory into strategic success had everything to do with America’s acceptance of one “condition”: retention of the Japanese emperor, as titular head of state. The authors call attention to the fact that both American and Japanese decision-making in the final stage of the war featured sharp internal disagreements. The emperor’s decisive embrace of the arguments of the Japanese “peace party” following the shocks of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, together with the Americans’ acceptance of his continuing role in the Japanese polity, was decisive for the (in retrospect) amazing success of the postwar settlement, and, for that matter, the durability of an alliance relationship that continues today—as is evidenced by, among other things, this coauthored article (as well as the previous one). Richard J. Shuster is a professor at the Naval War College; Rear Admiral, retired, Takuya Shimodaira, JMSDF, is a senior research fellow at the National Institute for Defense Studies in Tokyo.

In other matters, a perusal of our masthead will show that some routine rotation has occurred in the membership of our advisory board. The Naval War College and the Press thank off-going members Adam Bellow, Gale A. Mattox, Robert A. Silano, and Marin Strmecki most sincerely for their long years of yeoman service, and welcome aboard Ambassador Paula J. Dobriansky, Geoffrey Till, and Francis J. West, with thanks for their willingness to serve.

IF YOU VISIT US

Our editorial offices are located in Sims Hall, in the Naval War College Coasters Harbor Island complex. For building-security reasons, it would be necessary to meet you at the main entrance and escort you to our suite—give us a call ahead of time (401-841-2236).